



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,160	08/31/2001	Steven Viavant	50277-1747	1591

42425 7590 07/03/2007  
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE  
2055 GATEWAY PLACE  
SUITE 550  
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089

EXAMINER
----------

DIVECHA, KAMAL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/03/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/945,160

Applicant(s)

VIAVANT ET AL.

Examiner

KAMAL B. DIVECHA

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20070521.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1, 3, 5-19, 21-42, 44, 46-60, 62-83 and 85 are pending in this application.

Claims 2, 4, 20, 43, 45, 61 and 84 were previously cancelled.

**Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114**

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed on April 26, 2007 in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 26, 2007 has been entered.

**Response to Arguments**

Applicant's arguments filed April 26, 2007 in association with a Request For Continued Examination (RCE) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response filed, applicant argues in substance that:

- a. One significant distinction between the approach recited in claim 1 and the approaches described in Elnozahy, Mortensen and Guthrie is that in claim 1, the item generated by the application is both intercepted and modified at the server device in response to a request from the client process executing on the client device (Remarks, pg. 20-22).

In response to argument [a], Examiner agrees with applicant regarding the one distinction, however, performing the process of both intercepting and modifying at the server

Art Unit: 2151

device in response to a request from the client process executing on the client device as argued above, is considered obvious in view of Elnozahy, Mortensen and Guthrie, more specifically, in view of Guthrie.

Initially, Guthrie discloses the process of both intercepting and modifying the item, code and/or response at the proxy server or an intermediate device in response to client request from the client process executing on the client device (See fig. 2 item #204, fig. 9-11, and col. 3 L18-42).

If a proxy server is capable of intercepting and/or modifying the response at the proxy server, then its fairly obvious and known to one skilled in the art that the process can be implemented at the server device as in claim 1.

For example: by configuring and executing the interceptor code of Guthrie at the server device that originates the response, OR, by utilizing a plug-in module at the server device that originates the response to intercept and modify the response.

Moreover, in both scenarios, i.e. combination of Elnozahy, Mortensen and Guthrie and performing the process of both intercepting and modifying at the server device as in claim 1, the final results are the same, i.e. usefulness of the claimed invention in the present application will be same as the combination of Elnozahy, Mortensen and Guthrie.

For the at least these reasons, the rejection is maintained.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on May 21, 2007 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 13, 16-19, 21-42, 44, 46-51, 54, 57-60, 62-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elnozahy et al., (hereinafter Elnozahy, U. S. Patent No. 6,792,459 B2) in view of Mortensen et al. (hereinafter Mortensen, U. S. Patent No. 5,481,735), and further in view of Guthrie (U. S. Patent No. 6,266,681 B1).

As per claim 1, Elnozahy discloses a method for measuring client-side performance, the method comprising:

an application program executing on a server device processing a request from a client process executing on a client device and generating an item in response thereto that is to be sent to the client process (col. 2 L25-54, col. 5 L41 to col. 6 L19);

intercepting an item generated by an application program executing on a server device that is to be sent over a network to a client process executing on a client device, wherein the

Art Unit: 2151

intercepting is performed prior to arrival of the item at the client process (col. 5 L54-67 and fig. 1: i.e. pre-intercepting the web pages for instrumentation);

modifying the item transparently with respect to the application program to produce a modified item that includes code which, when processed by one or more processors at the client device causes: at the client device, measuring performance related to a service associated with the item, and at the client device (col. 4 L60 to col. 5 L8, col. 5 L17-25), performing one or more acts based on a measurement resulting from said step of measuring performance, wherein the one or more acts includes sending data indicating the measurement to an entity over the network (col. 6 L10-19); and

sending the modified item over the network to the client process executing on the client device (col. 6 L10-12).

However, Elnozahy does not disclose the process of intercepting the item generated by the application program and modifying the item after being requested by a client process and the process of determining a percentage of total items sent to the client process that are to be modified; determining, based upon the percentage of total items sent to the client process that are to be modified, whether the intercepted item is to be modified; and if based upon the percentage of total items sent to the client process that are to be modified, the intercepted item is to be modified.

Mortensen, from the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses the process of determining a percentage of total items that are to be modified and based upon the determination, modifying the intercepted item (col. 9 L4-40, fig. 7, col. 5 L53 to col. 8 L25, col. 10 L43-64, col. 20 L8-30, fig 8B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elnozahy, in view of Mortensen in order to determine when to modify the intercepted item based upon the statistics or the percentage of items.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated because it would have allowed and indicated when and which items are to be intercepted and modified (Mortensen, col. 9 L4-12).

However, Elnozahy in view of Mortensen does not disclose the process of intercepting the item generated by the application program and modifying the item after being requested by a client process (i.e. web pages are intercepted and modified after being requested by a client process, as argued by the applicant).

Guthrie, from the same field of endeavor explicitly discloses the process of intercepting the item generated by the application program running on the server and modifying the item to insert and/or add code in the item after the web pages are being requested by the client application or process, i.e. web browser (col. 1 L41 to col. 2 L64, col. 3 L16-67, col. 5 L13-34, col. 6 L1-40: clearly teaches the interception and modification of the html code, i.e. a response, after the request is received by the server and when the response is transmitted to the client), prior to the arrival of the item at the client process.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elnozahy in view of Mortensen and further in view of Guthrie, in order to intercept and modify the item after being requested by the client.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated because the interceptor code would have provided periodic updates to the code (Guthrie, col. 3 L18-50). Furthermore, the

Art Unit: 2151

injection system as in Guthrie, enables a user or client to supplement the user's browser with the additional functionality of the injectable component (i.e. injected code), without modifying the browser, by intercepting HTTP messages and placing code in HTML documents that causes the additional behavior to appear (Guthrie, col. 5 L13-34).

However, the combination of Elnozahy, Mortensen and Guthrie does not disclose the process of intercepting and modifying the item at the server device that originates the response.

But, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elnozahy, Mortensen and Guthrie in order to intercept and modify the item at the server device in response to clients request.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have enabled a user or client to supplement the user's browser with the additional functionality of the injectable component (i.e. injected code, in this case, it will be the code that measures performance), without modifying the browser, by intercepting HTTP messages and placing code in HTML documents that causes the additional behavior to appear (in this case, measuring performance, Guthrie, col. 5 L13-34).

As per claim 3, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the steps of measuring performance and performing one or more acts based on the measurement are performed transparently with respect to a user of the client process (col. 5L54 to col. 6 L20 and col. 2 L25-54).

As per claim 5, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein said step of sending the data to an entity comprises storing the data in a data structure that is automatically sent to a server device



Art Unit: 2151

associated with said service in response to a later request from the client process for said service (fig. 1, col. 2 L61 to col. 3 L7, col. 8 L57-67).

As per claim 6, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the client is a web browser and the data structure is a cookie stored on the client device by the web browser (fig. 1, col. 8 L58-65).

As per claim 7, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the step of modifying the item includes adding code to the item which, when processed by one or more processors at the client device, causes the client device to issue a request to the server device over the network (col. 5 L17-62), and said step of sending data indicating the measurement to an entity further comprises sending the request including the data indicating the measurement to the server device over the network (col. 6 L10-55 and fig. 3).

As per claim 8, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the request is for a particular file and in response to the request for the particular file no change is made by the client process to a page already rendered on a display of the client device (col. 7 L1-46).

As per claim 9, Elnozahy discloses the process of storing the data indicating the measurement in a log file on the server device (fig. 1 item #195, 190).

As per claim 10, Elnozahy discloses the process of storing the data indicating the measurement in a database of the entity on the network (fig. 1 item #195, 190).

As per claim 13, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the step of at the client device performing one or more acts based on the measurement comprises determining whether the measurement indicates performance has fallen below a threshold and if the measurement

indicates performance has fallen below the threshold, then sending a notification message (col. 9 L44-54, col. 2 L61 to col. 3 L7).

As per claim 16, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the measurement is a client response time between a first time when a user of the client process selects an item on a first web page rendered on a display of the client device and a second time when a second web page is fully rendered on the display of the client device (fig. 5, col. 7 L1-46).

As per claim 17, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein processing of the code by the one or more processors at the client device causes collecting ancillary information relating to one or more components of the client process that participate in obtaining the service from the application program and the at the client device performing one or more acts based on the measurement includes correlating the measurement with the ancillary information (fig. 1 item #195, fig. 3 item #260, item #250, fig. 5 item #565 and fig. 6 item #670).

As per claim 21, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the item to be sent to the client process is stored in a cache before the item is sent to the client process (fig. 1 item #115, 131-133); said step of intercepting the item comprises accessing the item in the cache and said step of sending the modified item to the client process comprises replacing the item in cache with the modified item (fig. 1 and col. 6 L1-10).

As per claim 22, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the cache is on the server device (fig. 1 item #110, 115 and col. 6 L1-10).

As per claim 24, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the item includes hypertext markup language (HTML) statements; and the client process is a web browser (col. 2 L25-36, fig. 1 item #160, col. 4 L20-32).

As per claim 25, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the web browser is configured to run javascript and the code comprises javascript statements (col. 4 L20-59).

As per claim 26, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the code conforms to a scripting language (col. 2 L25-54, col. 4 L20-45).

As per claim 27, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the code comprises a Java applet (col. 2 L25-36).

As per claim 29, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the step of modifying the item comprises appending the code to the end of the item (col. 2 L25-54 and col. 4 L10-67).

As per claim 30, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the item includes markup language statements and said step of modifying the item further comprises inserting the code at a particular statement of the markup language statements (col. 5 L41-67, col. 4 L19-45).

As per claim 31, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the code includes at least one of first code added to a first item and second code added to a second item; and said measuring performance comprises starting a time measurement based on the first code and ending a time measurement based on the second code (fig. 3 and col. 7 L1-46).

As per claim 32, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the first code is executed in response to a user of the client process clicking on a control included in the first item (col. 7 L1-11) and the second code is executed in response to fully loading the second item (fig. 3, col. 7 L1-46).

As per claim 33, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the code includes first code executed upon arrival of the first code at the client process and second code executed in response

Art Unit: 2151

to a data structure generated by the client process after arrival of the first code (fig. 3 and col. 7 L1-46).

As per claim 34, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the data structure describes an event at the client device (col. 7 L1-46).

As per claim 35, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the event is message received from an operating system executing on the client device (col. 7 L1-46).

As per claim 36, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the event is a manipulation of a control of the client device by a user (col. 7 L1-46).

As per claim 37, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein processing of the second code causes the measuring performance (col. 7 L1-46, col. 9 L1-54).

As per claim 38, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein processing of the second code causes recording a current time (col. 9 L1-20, col. 7 L1-46).

As per claim 39, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the item to be sent to the client process includes a third code to be executed in response to the data structure generated by the client process and processing the first code causes replacing the third code with the second code (col. 7 L1 to col. 8 L27 and col. 9 L1-67).

As per claim 40, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the code includes first code executed in response to data structure describing a first event generated by the client process and second code executed in response to a data structure describing a second event generated by the client process (col. 7 L1-46 and col. 9 L1-67 and fig. 3).

As per claim 41, Elnozahy discloses the process wherein the item to be sent to the client process includes a third code to be executed in response to the data structure describing the

Art Unit: 2151

second event generated by the client process and processing the first code causes replacing the third code with the second code (col. 7 L1 to col. 8 L27 and col. 9 L1-67).

As per claim 18, Elnozahy in view of Mortensen does not disclose the process of determining the type associated with the item and determining whether to perform said step of modifying the item based on the type of the item, after intercepting the item and before modifying the item.

Guthrie discloses the process of intercepting the item and determining the type associated with the item and determining whether to perform modification of the item based on the type of item (col. 6 L25-40, col. 10 L52 to col. 11 L6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Guthrie as stated above with Elnozahy and Mortensen, in order to make a determination whether to perform the process of modifying the item based on the type associated with the item.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have determined what type of code the clients browser would support and what code to inject into the item or the document (Guthrie, col. 11 L1-6).

As per claim 19, Elnozahy in view of Mortensen does not disclose the process of determining a unique reference associated with the item and determining whether to perform said step of modifying the item based on whether the unique reference matches a particular reference, after intercepting the item and before modifying the item.

Guthrie discloses the process of determining the unique reference associated with the item and determining whether to perform the step of modifying the item based on whether the unique reference matches a particular reference (col. 6 L25-40, col. 10 L52 to col. 11 L6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Guthrie as stated above with Elnozahy and Mortensen, in order to make a determination of modifying the item based on a unique reference.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 18.

As per claim 23, Elnozahy in view of Mortensen does not disclose the process wherein the cache is on a proxy server for the client process.

Guthrie explicitly discloses a system wherein the intercepting and the modifying process is conducted at the proxy server (fig. 2 item #204, col. 5 L13-34, col. 10 L52-67: please note that proxy server includes a cache memory).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Guthrie as stated above with Elnozahy, in order to include a proxy server with a cache memory.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because proxy servers decreases the response times of the client requests by retrieving the requested web pages from the proxy server. It would have also provided additional security in a global network environment (Guthrie, col. 2 L22-63).

As per claim 28, Elnozahy in view of Mortensen does not disclose the process wherein the code comprises an ActiveX module.

Art Unit: 2151

Guthrie, explicitly discloses the process of intercepting the HTML documents and modifying the html documents to include a code, wherein the code includes ActiveX component (col. 11 L1-49).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Guthrie with Elnozahy in order to include ActiveX modules.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated so that the code can be inserted in a form of ActiveX component into the HTML document (Guthrie, col. 11 L1-32, col. 6 L41-67).

As per claims 59-60, 64 and 69, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claim 18-19, 23 and 28. Therefore claims 59-60, 64 and 69 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 18-19, 64 and 69.

As per claims 42, 44, 46-51, 54, 57-58, 62-63, 65-68, 70-82, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 1, 3, 5-10, 13, 16-17, 21-22, 24-27, 29-41. Therefore claims 42, 44, 46-51, 54, 57-58, 62-63, 65-68, 70-82, are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1, 3, 5-10, 13, 16-17, 21-22, 24-27, 29-41.

Art Unit: 2151

2. Claims 11-12, 14-15, 52-53, 55-56, 83 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elnozahy et al., (hereinafter Elnozahy, U. S. Patent No. 6,792,459 B2), in view of Mortensen et al. (hereinafter Mortensen, U. S. Patent No. 5,481,735), in view of Guthrie (U. S. Patent No. 6,266,681 B1), and further in view of Burgess et al., (hereinafter Burgess, U. S. Patent No. 5,696,701).

As per claim 83, Elnozahy discloses a method for responding to client-side performance on a network connecting a client device executing a client process to a server device configured to execute an application program to provide a service (fig. 1), the method comprising the steps of:

- an application program executing on a server device processing a request from a client process executing on a client device and generating an item in response thereto that is to be sent to the client process (col. 2 L25-54, col. 5 L41 to col. 6 L19);

- intercepting an item produced by an application program prior to arrival of the item at the client process (col. 5 L54-67 and fig. 1: pre-intercepting the item for instrumentation);

- modifying the item transparently with respect to the application program to produce a modified item that includes code which, when processed by one or more processors at the client device causes: at the client device, measuring performance related to a service associated with the item (col. 4 L60 to col. 5 L8, col. 5 L17-25), and based on measurement resulting from said step of measuring performance, sending data indicating the measurement from the client device over the network to the server device (col. 6 L10-19 and fig. 1);

- sending the modified item over the network to the client process executing on the client device (col. 6 L10-12).



receiving the data over the network indicating the measurement (fig. 1 and col. 8 L15-25, col. 6 L11-19);

storing the data indicating the measurement in a database (fig. 1).

However, Elnozahy does not disclose does not disclose the process of intercepting the item generated by the application program and modifying the item after being requested by a client process (i.e. web pages are intercepted and modified after being requested by a client process, as argued by the applicant); the process of determining a percentage of total items sent to the client process that are to be modified; determining, based upon the percentage of total items sent to the client process that are to be modified, whether the intercepted item is to be modified; and if based upon the percentage of total items sent to the client process that are to be modified, the intercepted item is to be modified and the process wherein based on the data indicating the measurement, determining whether the data indicates performance has fallen below a threshold, and if the data indicates performance has fallen below the threshold, then sending a notification message.

Mortensen, from the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses the process of determining a percentage of total items that are to be modified and based upon the determination, modifying the intercepted item (col. 9 L4-40, fig. 7, col. 5 L53 to col. 8 L25, col. 10 L43-64, col. 20 L8-30, fig 8B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elnozahy, in view of Mortensen in order to determine when to modify the intercepted item based upon the statistics or the percentage of items.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have allowed and indicated when and which items are to be intercepted and modified (Mortensen, col. 9 L4-12).

However Elnozahy in view of Mortensen does not disclose the process of intercepting the item generated by the application program and modifying the item after being requested by a client process (i.e. web pages are intercepted and modified after being requested by a client process, as argued by the applicant) and the process wherein based on the data indicating the measurement, determining whether the data indicates performance has fallen below a threshold, and if the data indicates performance has fallen below the threshold, then sending a notification message.

Guthrie, from the same field of endeavor explicitly discloses the process of intercepting the item and/or the web pages generated by the application program running on the server and modifying the web pages to insert and/or add code in the item after the web pages are being requested by the client application or process, i.e. web browser (col. 1 L41 to col. 2 L64, col. 3 L16-67, col. 5 L13-34, col. 6 L1-40: clearly teaches the interception and modification of the html code, i.e. a response, after the request is received by the server and when the response is transmitted to the client).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elnozahy in view of Mortensen and further in view of Guthrie, in order to intercept and modify the web pages after being requested by the client.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because the interceptor code would have provided periodic updates to the code (Guthrie, col. 3 L18-50). Furthermore, the

Art Unit: 2151

injection system as in Guthrie, enables a user or client to supplement the user's browser with the additional functionality of the injectable component (i.e. injected code), without modifying the browser, by intercepting HTTP messages and placing code in HTML documents that causes the additional behavior to appear (Guthrie, col. 5 L13-34).

However, Elnozahy, Mortensen and Guthrie does not disclose the process wherein based on the data indicating the measurement, determining whether the data indicates performance has fallen below a threshold, and if the data indicates performance has fallen below the threshold, then sending a notification message.

Burgess, from the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses the process conducted at the server device, the process comprising receiving the data over the network indicating the measurement (col. 4 L40-42, col. 2 L33-37), storing the data indicating the measurement in a database (fig. 8 item #140, col. 56-60, col. 3 L62-67 and col. 4 L40-46) and based on the data indicating the measurement, determining whether the data indicates performance has fallen below a threshold and if the data indicates performance has fallen below the threshold, then sending a notification message to an administrator and a user (col. 6 L40-49, col. 6 L64 to col. 7 L5, col. 4 L13-15, col. 2 L38-45, col. 7 L4-12 and fig. 2 item #40).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elnozahy in view of Mortensen and Guthrie, and further in view of Burgess, in order to determine whether the data indicates performance has fallen below a threshold based on the data indicating the measurement, and if the data indicates performance has fallen below the threshold, then sending a notification message.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have determined the alertable events or performance and notify the appropriate parties regarding the alertable level of the client computer (Burgess, col. 4 L4-15, col. 7 L1-3). It would have also allowed an administrator to take action before the halt of the operating system of the client computer (Burgess, col. 8 L3-11).

As per claims 11-12, 14-15, 52-53, 55-56 and 85 they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 83. Therefore claims 11-12, 14-15, 52-53, 55-56 and 85 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 83.

#### *Additional References*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Housel, III et al., US 6,003,087: discloses server-side Interceptor module, See Fig. 2.
- b. Rosborough, U. S. Patent No. 5,764,912: Method and Apparatus for Determining Response time in Computer Applications.
- c. Yee et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,872,976: Client-based system for monitoring the Performance of Application programs.
- d. Abbott et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,314,463 B1: Method and System for Measuring Queue Length and Delay.
- e. Elnozahy et al., Pub. No.: US 2002/0112049 A1: Measuring Response Time for a Computer accessing Information from a network.

**Conclusion**

This Action is made Non-Final.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is 571-272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kamal Divecha/

Kamal Divecha  
Art Unit 2151.

  
**ZARNI MAUNG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**